

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 and 20-22 are pending in this application. Claims 19 and 24 are cancelled. The Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview of June 13, 2006. A statement of the substance of the interview is included, below. Reconsideration of claims 1-18 and 20-22 is respectfully requested.

Statement of the Substance of the Interview

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.133(b), the Applicant requests that the following statement of the substance of the interview conducted on June 13, 2006 be made of record. In that telephone interview Examiner Ryan Pitaro discussed claim 1 with Applicant's representative Karen L. Kaufman.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner was asked whether the term "navigation of the radial menu" as recited in amended claim 1 differed from "the menu positions moving in the corresponding direction so as to symbolize the movement direction" in U.S. Patent Number 6,816,079 (Kuenzner et al.) at Column 2, lines 32-34. The Examiner explained that Kuenzner, at col. 2 lines 27-32, describes "select[ing] the next submenu by means of the operating element. ... The rotating movement of the operating element is represented by an animation of the oval figure."

The Applicant's representative noted that Kuenzner further describes "[a]ll menu positions mov[ing] in the corresponding direction so as to symbolize the movement direction." After referring to FIG. 2 of the Kuenzner reference, agreement was reached that the disclosed embodiments in the present application are distinguishable from Kuenzner. However, the Examiner indicated that amendment of claim 1 would be required to better reflect the distinction. Applicant has amended claim 1 and the remaining independent claims to highlight this distinction, and the Examiner's rejection is thus believed to have been overcome.

Specification Not Entered Under 37 C.F.R. 1.125(b) and (c)

The Examiner did not enter the substitute specification filed on January 17, 2006 because it did not conform to 37 C.F.R. 1.125(b) and (c) because the example of the joystick is new matter. The Applicants presume that the amendments to paragraphs [001], [008], [009], [0010], [0011], [0012], [0014], and [0018] were entered as these amendments, which do not comprise an example of a joystick, were not mentioned in the Office Action mailed April 5, 2006.

Applicants cancel the amendment to paragraph [0013]. However, cancellation is not meant to suggest that the Applicants agree with the objection. The Applicants believe the amendment only clarified the subject matter that the Applicants have described as their invention. This cancellation is made only to expedite to examination of the application.



CONCLUSIONS

As the Applicants believe the Examiner's rejections to have been overcome in their entirety, the mailing of a *Notice of Allowance* in the present application is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative if it is believed such contact will further facilitate the allowance of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,
Timothy Twerdahl et al.

June 30, 2006

By:

Karen L. Kaufman (Reg. No. 57,239)

Carr & Ferrell LLP

2200 Geng Road

Palo Alto, CA 94303

T: 650.812.3400

F: 650.812.3444